

SUPER-REPLICATION WITH FIXED TRANSACTION COSTS

PETER BANK* AND YAN DOLINSKY†
HEBREW UNIVERSITY† AND TU BERLIN*

ABSTRACT. We study super-replication of contingent claims in markets with fixed transaction costs. The first result in this paper reveals that in reasonable continuous time financial market the super-replication price is prohibitively costly and leads to trivial buy-and-hold strategies. Our second result is derives non trivial scaling limits of super-replication prices in the binomial models with small fixed costs.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper deals with super-replication of European options in a market where trading incurs fixed transaction costs. Although many papers dealt with portfolio choice with fixed transaction costs, see for instance, ([1], [8], [12], [13], [15] and [16]), the problem of super-replicating a contingent claim was not considered to the best of our knowledge. By contrast, for the case of proportional transaction costs the topic of super-replication is widely studied. In [7] it was conjectured that in the Black-Scholes model, if the trading of the underlying asset is subject to proportional transaction costs, then the cheapest way to super-replicate call options is to buy the stock at the initial moment of time. This is the so-called buy-and-hold strategy. This conjecture was proved by many authors (see e.g., [3], [9], [10], [14], [18] and for game options in [5]). A natural way to overcome this negative result was proposed by Kusuoka in [11]. He considered scaling limits of the classical Cox–Ross–Rubinstein model of a complete binomial market and showed that, when transaction costs are also rescaled properly, super-replication prices converge to what is now known as a G -expectation in the sense of Peng ([17]).

The present paper is a first step in the development of the above theory for the fixed transaction costs case. The setup of fixed transaction costs corresponds to the case where any (nonzero) transaction incurs a fixed costs of $\kappa > 0$, regardless of the trading volume. Clearly, this amounts to a discontinuous, non-convex wealth dynamics, and so the convex duality methods which played a key role in the theory of proportional transaction costs (or their convex generalizations) are not available here.

As a first result, we show in Theorem 3.1 that, in a continuous time financial market with a risky asset exhibiting conditional full support property (see [9]), the cheapest way to super-replicate a convex option is to apply a trivial buy-and-hold

Date: October 31, 2016.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 91G10, 91G20.

Key words and phrases. binomial models, conditional full support, fixed transaction costs, super-replication.

Both authors are grateful to the Einstein Foundation for the financial support through its research project on “Game options and markets with frictions”. The author YD is also partially supported by Marie–Curie Career Integration Grant, no. 618235.

strategy. Hence, Theorem 3.1 can be viewed as an analog for fixed costs of the result in [9] which was obtained for the case of proportional transaction costs. By contrast to the classical duality used in [9], our proof uses the impulse control structure directly.

The second result in the present paper deals with the limiting behavior of super-replication prices in the Cox-Ross-Rubinstein (CRR) binomial models of [4]. Specifically, we consider a sequence of binomial models with constant volatility and study the asymptotic behavior of the super-replication prices for convex payoffs where the time step goes to zero and the fixed transaction costs are scaled linearly as a function of the time step. We characterize the scaling limit as a stochastic volatility control problem defined on the Brownian probability space.

Our proof relies heavily on the fact that the payoff of the European option is a convex function of the risky asset. Under this assumption we derive a non standard dual representation for the super-replication prices in the binomial models. This representation allow us to obtain the limit behavior of the super-replication prices by modifying ideas from [11]. We emphasize that, without the convexity condition on the payoff, the analysis is more complicated and remains an open question.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we formulate the main results of the paper. In Section 2 we formalize the super-replication problem with fixed costs. Section 3 shows that in models with conditional full support, trivial buy-and-hold strategies yield optimal super-replications of convex payoffs. In Section 4 we give the scaling limit of super-replication prices with small fixed costs. The proof of this result is prepared by a dual representation for our super-replication prices discussed in Section 4.1 and accomplished in Sections 4.2 and 4.3 by using tools from weak convergence to analyze the asymptotic behaviour of the dual terms

2. SUPERREPLICATION WITH FIXED TRANSACTION COSTS

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space with a progressively measurable process $S > 0$ which we take to describe the price evolution of some financial asset with initial price $S_0 = s_0 > 0$. The asset is traded at strictly positive fixed cost $\kappa > 0$ per transaction and so an investor with a bank account that for simplicity bears no interest can change her position only finitely often. We take $T = 1$ to be the investor's time horizon and so the times of intervention are given by a family of stopping times $\mathbb{T} = (\tau_i)_{i=1,2,\dots}$ such that

$$0 = \tau_0 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \dots \leq T = 1 \text{ with } \tau_i < \tau_{i+1} \text{ on } \{\tau_i < 1\}.$$

Let us denote by $\mathcal{T}$ the class of all such families $\mathbb{T}$ for which the number of interventions by time $T = 1$ is finite almost surely:

$$N(\mathbb{T}) := \sup \{i = 0, 1, \dots \mid \tau_i < 1\} < \infty \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-almost surely.}$$

Notice that for simplicity we do not count a possible initial intervention at time $\tau_0 = 0$.

Assume our investor seeks to hedge an option with $\mathcal{F}_1$ -measurable payoff $F \geq 0$ at maturity $T = 1$ by an investment strategy $(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{H})$ where $\mathbb{H} = (h_i)_{i=0,1,\dots}$ describes the $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_i}$ -measurable number of assets h_i to be held, respectively, over each period $(\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]$, $i = 0, 1, \dots$. Keeping in mind the fixed transaction costs $\kappa > 0$ and the free trade at time 0, the investor's gains from trading will by time $t \leq 1$ have

accrued to

$$G^\kappa(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{H})_t := \sum_{i=0,1,\dots} h_i(S_{\tau_{i+1} \wedge t} - S_{\tau_i \wedge t}) - \kappa \sup \{i = 0, 1, \dots : \tau_i < t\}.$$

To rule out the possibility of doubling strategies, the investor is confined to use admissible strategies from the set

$$\mathcal{A} := \{(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{H}) : G^\kappa(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{H}) \text{ bounded from below by a constant } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}\}.$$

The option's super-replication price is then given by

$$\mathbb{V}^\kappa(H) := \inf \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x + G^\kappa(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{H})_1 \geq F \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. for some } (\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{H}) \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Determining this super-replication price amounts to solving an impulse control problem with state constraint, a task which cannot be carried out explicitly without further assumptions. We will show however that for convex payoffs it can be computed in models with conditional full support (Section 3). At the other end of the modeling spectrum, we consider binomial models converging to a Black-Scholes dynamic, for which we compute the scaling limit for suitably scaled fixed costs (Section 4).

3. BUY-AND-HOLD WITH CONDITIONAL FULL SUPPORT

In this section, we are considering a continuous model $S = (S_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ exhibiting *conditional full support* as discussed by, e.g., [9]:

$$(3.1) \quad \supp \mathbb{P}[S|_{[t,1]} \in \cdot | \mathcal{F}_t] = C_{S_t}^+[t, 1] \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. for any } t \in [0, 1],$$

where, for $y \geq 0$, $C_y^+[t, 1]$ denotes the space of all continuous paths $[t, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ starting in y at time t .

Theorem 3.1. *For any financial model exhibiting conditional full support in the sense of (3.1), the super-replication price with fixed transaction costs $\kappa > 0$ of any convex payoff $F = f(S_1)$ with $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ continuous and convex is*

$$(3.2) \quad \mathbb{V}^\kappa(f(S_1)) = f(0) + s_0 f'(\infty) \text{ where } f'(\infty) := \sup_{s > 0} f'(s).$$

In case $f'(\infty) < \infty$, a super-hedge with initial capital $\mathbb{V}^\kappa(f(S_1))$ is to buy $h_0 := f'(\infty)$ units of the asset at time $\tau_0 = 0$ and hold these until $T = 1$.

Proof. That the right-hand side of (3.2) is sufficient for super-replication is trivial if $f'(\infty) = \infty$. If $f'(\infty) < \infty$, we can consider the described buy-and-hold strategy which yields

$$G^\kappa(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{H})_1 = f'(\infty)(S_1 - S_0) \geq f'_-(S_1)S_1 - f'(\infty)S_0 \geq f(S_1) - f(0) - f'(\infty)S_0$$

where both estimates are due to the convexity of f . This shows that $x_0 := f(0) + f'(\infty)S_0$ is enough to super-replicate $F = f(S_1)$.

Now consider $x < x_0$ and take a strategy $(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{H})$ with gains process $G := G^\kappa(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{H})$ such that $x + G_1 \geq F = f(S_1)$. We will show that such a strategy cannot be admissible. Specifically, with $\beta < f'(\infty)$ such that $x = f(0) + \beta S_0$, we will argue that

$$A_n := \{\tau_n < 1, S_{\tau_n} < 2/\delta, x + G_{\tau_n} < f(0) + \beta S_{\tau_n} - n\kappa/2\}$$

has positive probability for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$, where, $\delta \in (0, 1/s_0)$ is chosen small enough to ensure

$$f(0) + \beta s - \kappa < f(s) \text{ for all } s < \delta \text{ and all } s > 1/\delta.$$

Such a choice of δ is possible since f is continuous at zero and convex on $[0, \infty)$ with $f'(\infty) > \beta$.

We will proceed by induction. By our choices of $\delta < 1/s_0$ and of β , we even have $\mathbb{P}[A_0] = 1$. Now assume by way of contradiction that $\mathbb{P}[A_n] > 0$, but $\mathbb{P}[A_{n+1}] = 0$ for some n . Observe that on A_n we can estimate

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} x + G_{\tau_{n+1}} &= x + G_{\tau_n} + \beta(S_{\tau_{n+1}} - S_{\tau_n}) + (h_n - \beta)(S_{\tau_{n+1}} - S_{\tau_n}) \\ &< f(0) + \beta S_{\tau_{n+1}} - (n+1)\kappa/2 + (h_n - \beta)(S_{\tau_{n+1}} - S_{\tau_n}) - \kappa/2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, A_{n+1} contains the set $A_n \cap \{\tau_{n+1} < 1\} \cap B_n$ where

$$B_n := \left\{ \sup_{\tau_n \leq t \leq 1} S_t < 2/\delta, \quad \sup_{\tau_n \leq t \leq 1} \{(h_n - \beta)(S_t - S_{\tau_n})\} \leq \kappa/2 \right\}.$$

Notice that $\tau_{n+1} = 1$ must hold almost surely on $A_n \cap B_n$ since, with $\mathbb{P}[A_{n+1}] = 0$, we also have

$$0 = \mathbb{P}[A_n \cap \{\tau_{n+1} < 1\} \cap B_n] = \mathbb{P}[A_n \cap B_n] - \mathbb{P}[A_n \cap \{\tau_{n+1} = 1\} \cap B_n].$$

Now, $A_n \cap B_n$ contains $A_n \cap \{h_n \geq \beta\} \cap C_n$ where

$$C_n := B_n \cap \{S_1 \geq S_{\tau_n} \vee 1/\delta\}.$$

On $A_n \cap \{h_n \geq \beta\} \cap C_n$, however, the super-replication property is violated since, on this set, we have $\tau_{n+1} = 1$ almost surely and estimate (3.3) gives

$$x + G_1 = x + G_{\tau_{n+1}} < f(0) + \beta S_1 - (n+1)\kappa/2 < f(S_1)$$

by choice of δ and definition of C_n . Hence, we deduce

$$0 = \mathbb{P}[A_n \cap \{h_n \geq \beta\} \cap C_n] = \mathbb{E} [1_{A_n \cap \{h_n \geq \beta\}} \mathbb{P}[C_n \mid \mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}]].$$

As the conditional full support property (3.1) holds also at stopping times when it holds at deterministic times (see Lemma 2.9 in []), we have $\mathbb{P}[C_n \mid \mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}] > 0$ almost surely on $A_n \cap \{h_n \geq \beta\}$. So the above identity yields that in fact $\mathbb{P}[A_n \cap \{h_n \geq \beta\}] = 0$.

Similarly we will argue next that $\mathbb{P}[A_n \cap \{h_n < \beta\}] = 0$ so that in conjunction with $\mathbb{P}[A_n \cap \{h_n \geq \beta\}] = 0$ we arrive at the contradiction $\mathbb{P}[A_n] = 0$, completing our proof. Thus, let us first observe that $A_n \cap B_n$ contains $A_n \cap \{h_n < \beta\} \cap \tilde{C}_n$ where

$$\tilde{C}_n := B_n \cap \{S_1 \leq S_{\tau_n} \wedge \delta\}.$$

Up to a $\mathbb{P}$ -null set, however, we still have $A_n \cap \{h_n < \beta\} \cap \tilde{C}_n \subset \{\tau_{n+1} = 1\}$ and the super-replication property is again violated since, on this set, estimate (3.3) gives

$$x + G_1 = x + G_{\tau_{n+1}} < f(0) + \beta S_1 - (n+1)\kappa/2 < f(S_1)$$

by choice of δ and definition of $\tilde{C}_n$. Observing that also $\mathbb{P}[\tilde{C}_n \mid \mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}] > 0$ almost surely on $A_n \cap \{h_n < \beta\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}$ allows us to deduce by the same reasoning as used for C_n that indeed $\mathbb{P}[A_n \cap \{h_n < \beta\}] = 0$. $\square$

4. SCALING LIMIT OF BINOMIAL SUPERREPLICATION PRICES

In this section we consider binomial Cox-Ross-Rubinstein models with fixed transaction costs and describe the scaling limit of superreplication prices for convex claims. To wit, we let $\Omega = \{-1, +1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$, put $\zeta_i(\omega) = \omega_i$ for $\omega = (\omega_0, \omega_1, \dots) \in \Omega$ and let $\mathbb{P}$ be the measure under which the ζ_i are i.i.d. with $\mathbb{P}[\zeta_i = 1] = 1/2$, say. The n -period binomial price process can now be specified as

$$(4.4) \quad S_t^{(n)} = s_0 \exp \left(\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{[nt]} \zeta_i \right), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

and the underlying filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t^{(n)})$ is the one generated by $S^{(n)}$.

Obviously, when considered under their respective equivalent martingale measures $\mathbb{P}^{(n)} \approx \mathbb{P}$, these Cox-Ross-Rubinstein models $S^{(n)}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, converge to a Black-Scholes model with constant volatility $\sigma > 0$. In light of Theorem 3.1, it is clear that in order to get a non-trivial limit for the corresponding super-replication prices with fixed transaction costs, one has to rescale the fixed costs suitably. Our next result shows that the correct scaling is of the order $1/n$ and it identifies the resulting scaling limit as a G -expectation with penalty involving stochastic volatility models. These are specified as martingale exponentials

$$(4.5) \quad S_t^{(\nu)} = s_0 \exp \left(\int_0^t \nu_u dW_u - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \nu_u^2 du \right), \quad t \in [0, 1],$$

where W is a standard Brownian motion on some complete probability space $(\Omega^W, \mathcal{F}^W, \mathbb{P}^W)$ and where ν is taken from the set $\mathcal{A}^W$ of all bounded, real-valued processes $\nu \geq \sigma$ on this space which are progressively measurable with respect to the augmented filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t^W)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ generated by W .

Theorem 4.1. *For a convex payoff $F = f(S_1)$ with continuous, convex $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with polynomial growth, the scaling limit of superreplication prices in the binomial models (4.4) with fixed costs κ/n , $n = 1, 2, \dots$, is*

$$(4.6) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{V}^{\kappa/n}(f(S_1^{(n)})) = \inf_{\sigma \leq \nu \in \mathcal{A}^W} \mathbb{E}^W \left[f(S_1^{(\nu)}) + \kappa \int_0^1 g(\nu_t^2/\sigma^2) dt \right]$$

where $g : [1, \infty) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is the linear interpolation supported by $g(n) = 1/n$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$ and where the infimum is taken over all the probability spaces and volatility processes $\nu \geq \sigma$ described above.

The proof of this result is prepared by a duality result for super-replication with fixed costs presented in Section 4.1. Section 4.2 then establishes “ $\geq$ ” and Section 4.3 proves “ $\leq$ ” in (4.6), completing the proof.

4.1. Duality for binomial models with fixed transaction costs. The starting point for the proof of Theorem 4.1 is a form of dual characterization of super-replication prices with fixed costs in binomial models which works for the special case of convex payoff profiles.

To specify this duality, let us fix $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and consider the class $\mathcal{T}^{(n)}$ of systems $\mathbb{T} = \{0 = \tau_0 \leq \dots \leq \tau_n = 1\} \in \mathcal{T}$ of $(\mathcal{F}_t^{(n)})$ -stopping times with values in

$\{0/n, 1/n, \dots, 1\}$ such that if $\tau_{k+1}(\omega) < 1$ then

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \xi(\omega) &\equiv +1 \text{ for all } i \in \{n\tau_k(\omega) + 1, \dots, n\tau_{k+1}(\omega)\} \\ \text{or } \xi(\omega) &\equiv -1 \text{ for all } i \in \{n\tau_k(\omega) + 1, \dots, n\tau_{k+1}(\omega)\}. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, the stopping times $\tau_k \leq \tau_{k+1}$ are such that $\tau_{k+1}(\omega) = 1$ should $S^{(n)}(\omega)$ not be strictly increasing or strictly decreasing between $\tau_k(\omega)$ and $\tau_{k+1}(\omega)$. Also, already at time τ_k it is known by how many downward steps and how many upward steps the next stop τ_{k+1} will be reached. In other words, the number of these steps can be written as random variables functions $\phi_k^\downarrow(S_0^{(n)}, \dots, S_{\tau_k}^{(n)})$ and $\phi_k^\uparrow(S_0^{(n)}, \dots, S_{\tau_k}^{(n)})$, respectively, for each $k = 0, 1, \dots$. Now let $\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T}) \prec \mathbb{P}$ be the unique martingale measure for $(S_{\tau_k}^{(n)})_{k=0,1,\dots}$ with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_{\tau_k})_{k=0,1,\dots}$ such that (4.7) holds also for $\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T})$ -almost every ω with $\tau_{k+1}(\omega) = 1$. Hence, $\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T})$ only gives probability to the set where the terminal value $S_1^{(n)}$ is reached from the latest $S_{\tau_k}^{(n)}$ with $\tau_k < 1$ in a strictly monotone way.

Lemma 4.1. *In the n -step binomial model (4.4) with fixed transaction costs $\kappa > 0$, the super-replication costs of a payoff $F = f(S_1^{(n)})$ with f convex on $(0, \infty)$ are*

$$(4.8) \quad \mathbb{V}^\kappa(f(S_1^{(n)})) = \inf_{\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}^{(n)}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T})}[f(S_1^{(n)}) + \kappa N(\mathbb{T})].$$

Proof. Let us start by proving “ $\geq$ ” in (4.8). So take $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and an admissible $(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{H})$ such that $x + G(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{H})_1 \geq f(S_1^{(n)})$. By removing stopping points from $\mathbb{T} = \{\tau_k\}_{k=0,1,\dots}$ if necessary we obtain a possibly coarser stopping system $\tilde{\mathbb{T}} = \{\tilde{\tau}_k\}_{k=0,1,\dots}$ from our special class $\mathcal{T}^{(n)}$ such that, under the unique martingale measure $\mathbb{Q}(\tilde{\mathbb{T}})$ for $(S_{\tilde{\tau}_k}^{(n)})_{k=0,1,\dots}$, we have $\tau_k = \tilde{\tau}_k$ almost surely for $k = 0, 1, \dots$. Therefore, we still have the super-replication property $x + G(\tilde{\mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{H})_1 \geq f(S_1^{(n)})$ $\mathbb{Q}(\tilde{\mathbb{T}})$ -a.s. This allows us to conclude

$$x = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}(\tilde{\mathbb{T}})}[x + \sum_k h_k(S_{\tilde{\tau}_{k+1}}^{(n)} - S_{\tilde{\tau}_k}^{(n)})] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}(\tilde{\mathbb{T}})}[f(S_1^{(n)}) + \kappa N(\tilde{\mathbb{T}})]$$

as we wanted to show.

We next establish “ $\leq$ ” in (4.8). To this end, fix $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}^{(n)}$, put $\mathbb{Q} := \mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T})$, and denote $x = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[f(S_1^{(n)}) + \kappa N(\mathbb{T})]$. Observe that, under $\mathbb{Q}$ the (frictionless) financial market with stock price process $(S_{\tau_k}^{(n)})_{k=0,1,\dots,n}$ is a binomial market and hence complete. The unique martingale measure is $\mathbb{Q}$. Thus there exists measurable functions $\psi_k : \mathbb{R}_+^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$ such that

$$(4.9) \quad x + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \psi_k(S_{\tau_1}^{(n)}, \dots, S_{\tau_k}^{(n)}) (S_{\tau_{k+1}}^{(n)} - S_{\tau_k}^{(n)}) = f(S_1^{(n)}) + \kappa N(\mathbb{T}) \quad \mathbb{Q}\text{-a.s.}$$

Let us now use these maps ψ_k , $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$, in order to construct a super-replicating strategy for our n -step binomial market with fixed transaction costs κ . For this it will be convenient to consider the obvious expansion of our binomial model (4.4) from $[0, T] = [0, 1]$ to all of $[0, \infty)$. Let $\mathbb{P}^{(n)}$ still denote its locally equivalent martingale measure. Use the mappings $\phi^\downarrow$ and $\phi^\uparrow$ associated with the stopping system $\mathbb{T}$ to define another system stopping times $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}$ by $\tilde{\tau}_0 := 0$ and, for

$k = 0, 1, \dots,$

$$(4.10) \quad \tilde{\tau}_{k+1} := \min \left\{ t > \tilde{\tau}_k : \ln\left(\frac{S_t^{(n)}}{S_{\tilde{\tau}_k}^{(n)}}\right) / \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} = \phi_k^\uparrow(S_{\tilde{\tau}_1}^{(n)}, \dots, S_{\tilde{\tau}_k}^{(n)}) \right\} \\ \wedge \min \left\{ t > \tilde{\tau}_k : \ln\left(\frac{S_t^{(n)}}{S_{\tilde{\tau}_k}^{(n)}}\right) / \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} = -\phi_k^\downarrow(S_{\tilde{\tau}_1}^{(n)}, \dots, S_{\tilde{\tau}_k}^{(n)}) \right\}.$$

Clearly, these successive two-sided level passage times $\tilde{\tau}_1, \dots, \tilde{\tau}_n$ are finite $\mathbb{P}^{(n)}$ -almost surely, with $\tilde{\tau}_n \geq 1$. To obtain a strategy on $[0, 1]$ we truncate and consider the trading strategy $(\hat{\mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{H})$ intervening at times $\hat{\tau}_k := \tilde{\tau}_k \wedge 1$ according to $\mathbb{H} = (h_k)_{k=0,1,\dots}$ where

$$h_k := \psi_k(S_{\tilde{\tau}_1}^{(n)}, \dots, S_{\tilde{\tau}_k}^{(n)}), \quad k = 0, 1, \dots$$

In order to conclude it is sufficient to show for that $x + G(\hat{\mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{H})_1 \geq f(S_1^{(n)})$ $\mathbb{P}^{(n)}$ -a.s. In fact, we will argue that

$$(4.11) \quad x + G(\tilde{\mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{H})_{\tilde{\tau}_n} \geq f(S_{\tilde{\tau}_n}^{(n)}) \text{ and } \tilde{\tau}_n \geq 1 \quad \mathbb{P}^{(n)}\text{-a.s.}$$

which entails our assertion because

$$x + G(\hat{\mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{H})_1 = x + G(\tilde{\mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{H})_1 \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{(n)}}[x + G(\tilde{\mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{H})_{\tilde{\tau}_n} \mid \mathcal{F}_1^{(n)}] \\ \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^{(n)}}[f(S_{\tilde{\tau}_n}^{(n)})] \geq f(S_1^{(n)}).$$

Here, the first estimate holds because $G(\tilde{\mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{H})$ is a super-martingale under $\mathbb{P}^{(n)}$, the second estimate is due to (4.11), and the final one is due to Jensen's inequality for the convex function f and the $\mathbb{P}^{(n)}$ -martingale $S^{(n)}$ (which is uniformly bounded up to time $\tilde{\tau}_n$).

It remains to prove (4.11). For this observe that by construction both sides of this inequality are functionals of $(S_{\tilde{\tau}_k}^{(n)})_{k=0,1,\dots}$. Moreover, this process is a binomial martingale model under $\mathbb{P}^{(n)}$ with exactly the same jump characteristics as $(S_{\tau_k}^{(n)})_{k=0,1,\dots}$ under $\mathbb{Q}$ and therefore

$$\text{Law}((S_{\tilde{\tau}_k}^{(n)})_{k=0,1,\dots} \mid \mathbb{P}^{(n)}) = \text{Law}((S_{\tau_k}^{(n)})_{k=0,1,\dots} \mid \mathbb{Q}).$$

As a consequence, (4.11) is immediate from (4.9). $\square$

For later use let us also note the following lemma which illustrates the trade-off to be struck in our dual description of the super-replication problem: For a convex payoff, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T})}[f(S_1^{(n)})]$ may decrease when we add stops to $\mathbb{T}$ while of course any added stop will let the number of interventions $N(\mathbb{T})$ increase.

Lemma 4.2. *If $\mathbb{T}' \in \mathcal{T}^{(n)}$ is a refinement of $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}^{(n)}$ in the sense that for any τ_k from $\mathbb{T}$ we have*

$$\tau_k = \max \{ \tau'_{k'} \in \mathbb{T}' \mid \tau'_{k'} \leq \tau_k \},$$

then for any convex payoff profile $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T}')} [f(S_1^{(n)})] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T})} [f(S_1^{(n)})].$$

Proof. For any $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}^{(n)}$, the measure $\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T})$ is a martingale measure for $(S_{\tau_k}^{(n)})_{k=0,1,\dots}$ that is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ and which attains the frictionless super-replication price of convex payoff $f(S_1^{(n)})$ when trading is allowed only at times contained in $\mathbb{T}$. Obviously, refining $\mathbb{T}$ to $\mathbb{T}' \in \mathcal{T}^{(n)}$ offers more flexibility to

find super-replication strategies and thus cannot lead to a higher super-replication price. $\square$

4.2. Proof of the upper bound for super-replication prices. In this section we will prove that “ $\geq$ ” holds in our formula (4.6) for the scaling limit. More precisely, we will establish

$$(4.12) \quad \liminf_n \mathbb{V}^{\kappa/n}(f(S_1^{(n)})) \geq \inf_{\sigma \leq \nu \in \mathcal{A}^W} \mathbb{E}^W \left[f(S_1^{(\nu)}) + \kappa \int_0^1 g(\nu_t^2 / \sigma^2) dt \right]$$

Without loss of generality (by passing to a sub-sequence) we assume that the limit $\lim_n \mathbb{V}^{\kappa/n}(f(S_1^{(n)}))$ exists (may be ∞).

By Lemma 4.1, we can find, for $n = 1, 2, \dots$, stopping systems $\mathbb{T}_0^{(n)} \in \mathcal{T}^{(n)}$ such that

$$\mathbb{V}^{\kappa/n}(f(S_1^{(n)})) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T}_0^{(n)})}[f(S_1^{(n)}) + \frac{\kappa}{n}N(\mathbb{T}_0^{(n)})] - \frac{1}{n}.$$

Hence, the $\liminf$ in (4.12) can be estimated if we get an understanding of, as $n \uparrow \infty$, of the joint law of $S_1^{(n)}$ and $N(\mathbb{T}_0^{(n)})$ under $\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T}_0^{(n)})$. While tightness of this sequence of laws is not obvious, it can be established for a suitable refinement of $\mathbb{T}_0^{(n)}$ using an argument which we adapt from Kusuoka [11]. To this end, fix $m \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and refine $\mathbb{T}_0^{(n)}$ if necessary in such a way that at most m steps are taken between any two stopping times. This gives us a stopping system $\mathbb{T}^{(n)} = \{\tau_k^{(n)}\}_{k=0,1,\dots} \in \mathcal{T}^{(n)}$

with $N(\mathbb{T}_0^{(n)}) \geq N(\mathbb{T}^{(n)}) - [(n-1)/m]$ and

$$(4.13) \quad \tau_{k+1}^{(n)} - \tau_k^{(n)} \leq \frac{m}{n} \text{ on } \{\tau_{k+1}^{(n)} < 1\}.$$

In light of Lemma 4.2, we can now conclude that $\mathbb{Q}^{(n)} := \mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T}^{(n)})$ satisfies

$$(4.14) \quad \mathbb{V}^{\kappa/n}(f(S_1^{(n)})) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^{(n)}}[f(S_1^{(n)}) + \frac{\kappa}{n}N(\mathbb{T}^{(n)})] - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{\kappa}{n}[(n-1)/m].$$

Hence (4.12) will be established upon letting $m \uparrow \infty$ once we can show that the $\liminf_{n \uparrow \infty}$ of the expectations in (4.14) is not smaller than the right-hand side of (4.12) for each $m = 1, 2, \dots$. This will be established using Kusuoka’s tightness argument for which we consider the processes $M^{(n)}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, given by

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} M_1^{(n)} &:= S_1^{(n)}, \\ M_t^{(n)} &:= S_{\tau_{k+1}^{(n)}}^{(n)} \text{ for } t \in [\tau_k^{(n)} + 1/n, \tau_{k+1}^{(n)} + 1/n) \cap [0, 1], \quad k = 0, 1, \dots \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $M^{(n)}$ is a version of the $\mathbb{Q}^{(n)}$ -martingale with terminal value $S_1^{(n)}$:

$$M_t^{(n)} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^{(n)}}[S_1^{(n)} \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{(n)}], \quad t \in [0, 1], \quad \mathbb{Q}^{(n)}\text{-a.s.}$$

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose $\mathbb{T}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{T}^{(n)}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, are partitions of $[0, 1]$ such that (4.13) holds $\mathbb{Q}^{(n)}$ -almost surely where $\mathbb{Q}^{(n)} = \mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T}^{(n)})$. Then the sequence of distributions $(\text{Law}(S^{(n)} \mid \mathbb{Q}^{(n)}))_{n=1,2,\dots}$ is tight on the Skorohod space $\mathbb{D}[0, 1]$. Any weak accumulation point is the law of a strictly positive continuous martingale M (in its own filtration) under some probability measure $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ such that*

$$(4.16) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}}[\max_{t \in [0,1]} M_t^p] \leq \sup_{n=1,2,\dots} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^{(n)}}[\max_{t \in [0,1]} (M_t^{(n)})^p] < \infty \text{ for any } p \geq 0.$$

Moreover, the stochastic logarithm L of M/s_0 , i.e., the continuous local martingale L such that $M = s_0 \mathcal{E}(L)$ has quadratic variation $\langle L \rangle$ absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure with density $\nu^2 := d\langle L \rangle/dt$.

In addition, along a suitable subsequence, we have the weak convergence

$$\text{Law}(S^{(n)}, \int_0^\cdot \alpha_s^{(n)} ds \mid \mathbb{Q}^{(n)}) \rightarrow \text{Law}(M, \int_0^\cdot \frac{1}{2} (\nu_t^2/\sigma^2 - 1) dt \mid \hat{\mathbb{P}}), \quad n \uparrow \infty,$$

on $\mathbb{D}[0, 1] \times \mathbb{D}[0, 1]$ where

$$(4.17) \quad \alpha_t^{(n)} := \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sigma} |M_t^{(n)} - S_t^{(n)}|/S_t^{(n)}, \quad t \in [0, 1]$$

with $M^{(n)}$ given by (4.15).

Proof. From (4.13) it follows that $\alpha_t^{(n)}$ is $\mathbb{Q}^{(n)}$ a.s. uniformly bounded (in n and t), and so the tightness of $(\text{Law}(S^{(n)} \mid \mathbb{Q}^{(n)}))_{n=1,2,\dots}$ and the estimate (4.16) follow from Propositions 4.8 and 4.27 in [11]. The second part of the Lemma follows from Lemma 7.1 in [7]. $\square$

By Skorohod's representation theorem, we can find processes $\hat{S}^{(n)}, \hat{M}^{(n)}, \hat{\alpha}^{(n)}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, on a joint probability space $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mathbb{P}})$ which have the for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$ the same joint law as their counterparts $(S^{(n)}, M^{(n)}, \alpha^{(n)})$ under $\mathbb{Q}^{(n)}$ and which are such that $(\hat{S}^{(n)}, \hat{M}^{(n)}, \int_0^\cdot \hat{\alpha}_u^{(n)} du)$ converges $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost surely uniformly in time to $(\hat{M}, \hat{M}, \int_0^\cdot \frac{\hat{\nu}^2 - \sigma^2}{2\sigma} dt)$ where $\hat{M} = s_0 \mathcal{E}(\hat{L})$ is a continuous $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ -martingale with finite moments of arbitrary order and $\hat{\nu}^2$ is the density of the quadratic variation of its stochastic logarithm $\hat{L}$ with respect to Lebesgue measure.

Moreover, we can define a system $\hat{\mathbb{T}}^{(n)}$ of stopping times $\hat{\tau}_k^{(n)}$, $k = 0, 1, \dots$, for the filtration generated by $\hat{S}^{(n)}$ such that also the joint $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ -law of these with $(\hat{S}^{(n)}, \hat{M}^{(n)})$ coincides with the joint law under $\mathbb{Q}^{(n)}$ of the stopping times $\tau_k^{(n)}$, $k = 0, 1, \dots$, with $(S^{(n)}, M^{(n)})$. In particular, we conclude from (4.13) that

$$\hat{\tau}_{k+1}^{(n)} - \hat{\tau}_k^{(n)} \leq \frac{m}{n} \hat{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.}$$

From (4.4) and (4.15), we thus get the Taylor expansion

$$\hat{\alpha}_t^{(n)} = n\hat{\tau}_{k+1}^{(n)} - [nt] + O(m^2/\sqrt{n}) \hat{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s. for } t \in [\hat{\tau}_k^{(n)} + 1/n, \hat{\tau}_{k+1}^{(n)} + 1/n) \cap [0, 1],$$

where $|O(m^2/\sqrt{n})|$ is uniformly in time and in $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.e. scenario less than or equal to $m^2/\sqrt{n}$.

The last observations allow us to apply Lemma 4.4 below (with $b(t) := \hat{\nu}_t^2/\sigma^2$) to get the estimate

$$(4.18) \quad \liminf_n \frac{N(\hat{\mathbb{T}}^{(n)})}{n} \geq \int_0^1 g(\nu_t^2/\sigma^2) dt \hat{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.e.}$$

where g is the linearly interpolating function defined in Theorem 4.1.

Taking $\liminf_n$ in (4.14) now gives

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_n \mathbb{V}^{\kappa/n}(f(S_1^{(n)})) &\geq \liminf_n \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^{(n)}}[f(S_1^{(n)}) + \kappa N(\mathbb{T}^{(n)})/n] - \frac{\kappa}{m} \\ &= \liminf_n \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}}[f(\hat{S}_1^{(n)}) + \kappa N(\hat{\mathbb{T}}^{(n)})/n] - \frac{\kappa}{m} \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}}[f(\hat{M}_1) + \kappa \int_0^1 g(\hat{\nu}_t^2/\sigma^2) dt] - \frac{\kappa}{m} \end{aligned}$$

where the final step is due to Fatou's lemma and (4.18). Applying a randomization technique similar to Lemma 7.2 in [7] and letting $m \uparrow \infty$ now proves our assertion (4.12).

Lemma 4.4. *For $n = 1, 2, \dots$, let $\mathbb{T}^{(n)} = \{0 = t_0^{(n)} \leq t_1^{(n)} \leq \dots \leq t_n^{(n)} = 1\}$ be deterministic partitions of $[0, 1]$ such that $nt_k^{(n)} \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$ and $t_{k+1}^{(n)} - t_k^{(n)} \leq m/n$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$. Suppose the functions*

$$a^{(n)}(t) := nt_{k+1}^{(n)} - [nt], \quad t_k^{(n)} < t \leq t_{k+1}^{(n)} \text{ for } k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1,$$

satisfy

$$(4.19) \quad \int_0^1 a^{(n)}(t) dt \rightarrow \int_0^1 \frac{1}{2}(b(t) - 1) dt \text{ uniformly on } [0, 1]$$

for some $b \in L^1([0, 1], dt)$. Then we have

$$\liminf_n \frac{N(\mathbb{T}^{(n)})}{n} \geq \int_0^1 g(b(t)) dt$$

where g is the linearly interpolating function defined in Theorem 4.1.

Proof. Without loss of generality (by passing to a sub-sequence) we assume that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} N(\mathbb{T}^{(n)})/n$ exists. For any n introduce the function $b_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ by $b_n(t) = 0$ and

$$b_n(t) = n(t_{k+1}^{(n)} - t_k^{(n)}), \quad t_k^{(n)} \leq t < t_{k+1}^{(n)}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1.$$

Let us notice that

$$(4.20) \quad \frac{N(\mathbb{T}^{(n)})}{n} = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{b_n(t)} dt.$$

Simple calculations yield

$$\int_{t_k^{(n)}}^{t_{k+1}^{(n)}} \left[\frac{1}{2}(b_n(t) - 1) - a_n(t) \right] dt = 0.$$

This together with (4.19) and the fact that $n(t_{k+1}^{(n)} - t_k^{(n)})$ is bounded uniformly in k and n gives

$$(4.21) \quad \int_0^t b_n(u) du \rightarrow \int_0^t b(u) du \text{ uniformly in } t \in [0, 1].$$

The Komlos Lemma (see Lemma A 1.1 in [6]) implies that there exists a sequence of functions $\tilde{b}_n \in \text{conv}(b_n, b_{n+1}, \dots)$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, such that $\tilde{b}_n$ converges Lebesgue-almost everywhere to a function $\tilde{b}$. In fact, $\tilde{b} = b$ a.e. since by dominated convergence theorem and (4.21) we get

$$\int_0^t \tilde{b}(u) du = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \tilde{b}_n(u) du = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t b_n(u) du = \int_0^t b(u) du \text{ for any } t \in [0, 1].$$

Finally, from (4.20), the fact that the function g is convex and continuous with $g(b_n) = \frac{1}{b_n}$ (as b_n is integer valued) we obtain

$$\lim_n N(\mathbb{T}^{(n)})/n = \lim_n \int_0^1 g(b_n(t)) dt \geq \lim_n \int_0^1 g(\tilde{b}_n(t)) dt = \int_0^1 g(b(t)) dt$$

and the result follows. $\square$

4.3. Proof of the lower bound for super-replication prices. In this section we will establish “ $\leq$ ” for our formula (4.6) for the scaling limit of super-replication prices. More precisely, we will establish

$$(4.22) \quad \limsup_n \mathbb{V}^{\kappa/n}(f(S_1^{(n)})) \leq \mathbb{E}^W \left[f(S_1^{(\nu)}) + \kappa \int_0^1 g(\nu_t^2/\sigma^2) dt \right]$$

where $\nu \geq \sigma$ is a volatility process in $\mathcal{A}^W$ on some filtered probability space $(\Omega^W, \mathcal{F}^W, (\mathcal{F}_t^W), \mathbb{P}^W)$ supporting a Brownian motion W as considered in Theorem 4.1. In fact, it suffices to show this for piecewise constant ν :

Lemma 4.5. *For any $\nu \in \mathcal{A}^W$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{A}^W$ of the simple form*

$$(4.23) \quad \tilde{\nu}_t = \sum_{j=0}^J \sigma \sqrt{\rho_j(S_{t_0}^{(\tilde{\nu})}, \dots, S_{t_j}^{(\tilde{\nu})})} 1_{(t_j, t_{j+1}]}(t)$$

for some times $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_J = 1$ and continuous bounded functions $\rho_j : \mathbb{R}^j \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ such that

$$|\mathbb{E}^W \left[f(S_1^{(\nu)}) + \kappa \int_0^1 g(\nu_t^2/\sigma^2) dt \right] - \mathbb{E}^W \left[f(S_1^{(\tilde{\nu})}) + \kappa \int_0^1 g(\tilde{\nu}_t^2/\sigma^2) dt \right]| < \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let $\nu \in \mathcal{A}^W$ and let C be a constant such that $\nu \leq C$ a.s. Using similar density arguments as in Lemma 3.4 in [2] (for $d = 1$) we get that there exists a sequence $\nu^{(n)}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, such that $\nu^{(n)} \leq C$ is of the simple form given by (4.23) and $\nu^{(n)} \rightarrow \nu$ $\mathbb{P}^W \otimes dt$ a.s. This together with the uniform integrability (due to $\nu^{(n)} \leq C$) of the sequence $f(S_1^{(\nu^{(n)})}) + \kappa \int_0^1 g((\nu_t^{(n)})^2/\sigma^2)$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, implies the Lemma. $\square$

Again, without loss of generality we assume that $\lim_n \mathbb{V}^{\kappa/n}(f(S_1^{(n)}))$ exists. The duality result in Lemma 4.1 suggests for the proof of (4.22) to construct a sequence of stopping systems $\mathbb{T}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{T}^{(n)}$ with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_t^{(n)})$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, such that under the associated measures $\mathbb{Q}^{(n)} := \mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T}^{(n)})$ the processes $S^{(n)}$ of (4.4) converge in law to $S^{(\nu)}$. This will be done next.

To fix ideas, let us first focus on the initial period $[t_0, t_1) = [0, t_1)$ where we wish to obtain the constant $\nu_0^2 = \sigma^2 \rho_0 \in [0, \infty)$ as the limiting local variance. Inspection of the argument in the previous section suggests that for $\rho_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ this can be accomplished by stopping any ρ_0 upwards or downwards steps. For ν_0^2 between natural multiples of σ^2 , though, we have to mix stopping after $\lfloor \rho_0 \rfloor$ steps and after $\lfloor \rho_0 \rfloor + 1$ steps in just the right proportions. For instance, if we want to obtain asymptotically the local variance $1.5\sigma^2$ (i.e. $\rho_0 = 1.5$), we just alternate between stopping after $\lfloor \rho_0 \rfloor = 1$ step and after $\lfloor \rho_0 \rfloor + 1 = 2$ steps.

In general, the following construction will work: For $j = 0, \dots, J$, we subdivide the time interval $[nt_j/n, [nt_{j+1}]/n)$ into $[nt_{j+1}] - [nt_j] \approx n(t_{j+1} - t_j) = O(n)$ periods of length $1/n$. These $O(n)$ periods can be covered by $\sqrt{n(t_{j+1} - t_j)} = O(\sqrt{n})$ blocks of the same number $\sqrt{n(t_{j+1} - t_j)} = O(\sqrt{n})$ of successive time points. Denote by

$$\rho_j^{(n)} := \rho_j(S_{[nt_0]/n}^{(n)}, \dots, S_{[nt_j]/n}^{(n)})$$

a proxy for the multiple of σ^2 we want to implement asymptotically as local variance over the interval $[t_j, t_{j+1})$. Take $\lambda_j^{(n)}$ to be the unique solution $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ of

$$\rho_j^{(n)} = \lambda[\rho_j^{(n)}] + (1 - \lambda)([\rho_j^{(n)}] + 1).$$

In each of the above $O(\sqrt{n})$ blocks of length $O(\sqrt{n})$, we will first stop every time after $[\rho_j^{(n)}]$ steps have been made by the binomial model consecutively in the same direction (i.e. all upwards or all downwards) and we will not stop at all before reaching the time horizon $T = 1$ in scenarios where different directions are taken in this period. This continues until we have covered a fraction of $\lambda_j^{(n)}$ of the present block's $O(\sqrt{n})$ periods. For the remaining fraction $1 - \lambda_j^{(n)}$ of periods in this block, we will proceed similarly but with a rhythm of stopping every $[\rho_j^{(n)}] + 1$ steps instead of $[\rho_j^{(n)}]$. After that we repeat this procedure for all of the $O(\sqrt{n})$ blocks we separated the interval $[[nt_j]/n, [nt_{j+1}]/n]$ into in the beginning. Then we proceed similarly with the next interval $[[nt_{j+1}]/n, [nt_{j+2}]/n]$ until all of these intervals are treated.

Let us next analyze the asymptotic transaction costs and variance which this procedure entails. We can do this separately on each of the intervals $[t_j, t_{j+1})$, $j = 0, \dots, J$. So fix such a j and let n_1 and n_2 denote the number of times where we stop every $[\rho_j^{(n)}]$ and $[\rho_j^{(n)}] + 1$ binomial steps, respectively. Then we have

$$n_1[\rho_j^{(n)}] + n_2([\rho_j^{(n)}] + 1) = \sqrt{n(t_{j+1} - t_j)} + O(1)$$

and, in order to obtain the right asymptotic variance, we want to have at the same time that

$$n_1[\rho_j^{(n)}]^2 + n_2([\rho_j^{(n)}] + 1)^2 = \rho_j^{(n)} \sqrt{n(t_{j+1} - t_j)} + O(1).$$

We conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n_1}{\sqrt{n(t_{j+1} - t_j)}} &= \frac{1 + [\rho_j^{(n)}] - \rho_j^{(n)}}{[\rho_j^{(n)}]} + O(1/\sqrt{n}), \\ \frac{n_2}{\sqrt{n(t_{j+1} - t_j)}} &= \frac{\rho_j^{(n)} - [\rho_j^{(n)}]}{1 + [\rho_j^{(n)}]} + O(1/\sqrt{n}), \end{aligned}$$

and the fraction of periods covered in $[\rho_j^{(n)}]$ steps, respectively, is the desired

$$\lambda_j^{(n)} = \frac{n_1[\rho_j^{(n)}]}{\sqrt{n(t_{j+1} - t_j)}} + O(1/\sqrt{n}) = 1 + [\rho_j^{(n)}] - \rho_j^{(n)} + O(1/\sqrt{n})$$

The transaction costs on this block are equal to $\kappa(n_1 + n_2)/n$, and so we conclude that the transaction costs on the whole interval $[[nt_j]/n, [nt_{j+1}]/n]$ amount to

$$(4.24) \quad \kappa(n_1 + n_2) \sqrt{n(t_{j+1} - t_j)}/n + O(1/n) = \kappa(t_{j+1} - t_j)g(\rho_j^{(n)}) + O(1/\sqrt{n}).$$

Furthermore, we get that for any $t \in (t_j, t_{j+1})$

$$(4.25) \quad \int_{t_j}^t \alpha_s^{(n)} ds = O(1/\sqrt{n}) + \frac{t - t_j}{\sqrt{n(t_{j+1} - t_j)}} \left(0 + 1 + 2 + \dots + [\rho_j^{(n)}] - 1 \right) n_1 \\ \frac{t - t_j}{\sqrt{n(t_{j+1} - t_j)}} \left(0 + 1 + 2 + \dots + [\rho_j^{(n)}] \right) n_2 = O(1/\sqrt{n}) + \frac{\rho_j^{(n)} - 1}{2} (t - t_j).$$

Having constructed for $n = 1, 2, \dots$ a system of stopping times $\mathbb{T}^{(n)} = \{\tau_k^{(n)}\} \in \mathcal{T}^{(n)}$, we can let $\mathbb{Q}^{(n)} := \mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{T}^{(n)})$ denote the associated martingale measure for $(S_{\tau_k^{(n)}}^{(n)})_{k=0,1,\dots}$. Observe that along with the functions ρ_j also the $\rho_j^{(n)}$ are bounded uniformly, say by a constant $m \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$. As a consequence, the increments between any two successive intervention times are bounded by m/n $\mathbb{Q}^{(n)}$ -almost surely as in (4.13). We can thus invoke Lemma 4.3 to conclude that, possibly along a subsequence again denoted by n , we have the weak convergence

$$\text{Law}(S^{(n)}, \int_0^\cdot \alpha_s^{(n)} ds \mid \mathbb{Q}^{(n)}) \rightarrow \text{Law}(M, \int_0^\cdot \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\nu}_t^2 / \sigma^2 - 1) dt \mid \hat{\mathbb{P}}), \quad n \uparrow \infty,$$

on $\mathbb{D}[0, 1] \times \mathbb{D}[0, 1]$ for some $\hat{\nu} \geq \sigma$ with $\hat{\nu}^2 = d\langle L \rangle / dt$ for the stochastic logarithm L of $M = s_0 \mathcal{E}(L)$. In fact, M and $\hat{\nu}$ are just copies, respectively, of our original $S^{(\nu)}$ and ν :

Just as after Lemma 4.3 in the previous section, we now use Skorohod's representation theorem to see that without loss of generality we can assume to have $\hat{S}^{(n)}$, $\hat{M}^{(n)}$ and $\hat{\alpha}^{(n)}$ on $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mathbb{P}})$ which have, for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$, the same joint law as their counterparts $(S^{(n)}, M^{(n)}, \alpha^{(n)})$ under $\mathbb{Q}^{(n)}$ and which are such that, as $n \uparrow \infty$,

$$(4.26) \quad (\hat{S}^{(n)}, \hat{M}^{(n)}, \int_0^\cdot \hat{\alpha}_u^{(n)} du) \rightarrow (M, M, \int_0^\cdot \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\nu}_t^2 / \sigma^2 - 1) dt)$$

uniformly in time $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost surely, where $\hat{\nu}^2 := d\langle L \rangle / dt$ for the stochastic logarithm L of M . For $n = 1, 2, \dots$, we can also reconstruct from $\hat{S}^{(n)}$ a system of stopping times $\hat{\mathbb{T}}^{(n)}$ for the filtration generated by $\hat{S}^{(n)}$ which corresponds to our $\mathbb{T}^{(n)}$ constructed above. From (4.25)–(4.26) and the fact that the functions ρ_j , $j = 1, \dots, J$ are continuous it follows that

$$(4.27) \quad \hat{\nu}_t = \sum_{j=0}^J \sigma \sqrt{\rho_j(M_{t_0}, \dots, M_{t_j})} 1_{(t_j, t_{j+1}]}(t) \quad \mathbb{P} \otimes dt\text{-a.e.}$$

The proof of (4.22) is now completed by arguing that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}^{\kappa/n}(f(S_1^{(n)})) &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^{(n)}}[f(S_1^{(n)}) + \frac{\kappa}{n} N(\mathbb{T}^{(n)})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}}[f(\hat{S}_1^{(n)})] + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa N(\hat{\mathbb{T}}^{(n)})/n] \\ &\rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}}[f(M_1)] + \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa \int_0^1 g(\hat{\nu}_t^2 / \sigma^2) dt] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^W \left[f(S_1^{(\nu)}) + \kappa \int_0^1 g(\nu_t^2 / \sigma^2) dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here the estimate in the first line is immediate from Lemma 4.1 and the first identity is due to our Skorohod representation. The convergence $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}}[f(\hat{S}_1^{(n)})] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}}[f(M_1)]$ is due to dominated convergence since uniform integrability follows from the polynomial growth of f and (4.16); the convergence of the other expectations also follows by dominated convergence since all random variables involved take values in $[0, 1]$ and since (4.24) in conjunction with (4.27) yields $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. convergence of the costs $\kappa N(\hat{\mathbb{T}}^{(n)})/n$ to $\kappa \int_0^1 g(\hat{\nu}_t^2 / \sigma^2) dt$. The final identity is immediate from Lemma 4.6 below.

Lemma 4.6. *We have*

$$(4.28) \quad \text{Law}(S^{(\nu)} \mid \mathbb{P}^W) = \text{Law}(M \mid \hat{\mathbb{P}})$$

Proof. Let us prove by induction that for any $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$ the distribution of $M|_{[0, t_j]}$ equals to the distribution of $S^{(\nu)}|_{[0, t_j]}$. For $j = 0$ the statement is trivial. Assume that the statement is correct for j . Define the stochastic process

$$B_t = \frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{\rho_j(M_{t_0}, \dots, M_{t_j})}} \int_{t_j}^{t+t_j} \frac{dM_u}{M_u}, \quad t \in [0, t_{j+1} - t_j].$$

From the Levy Theorem and (4.27) it follows that B is a Brownian motion on $[0, t_{j+1} - t_j]$ independent of $M|_{[0, t_j]}$. Clearly, for $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}]$,

$$(4.29) \quad M_t = M_{t_j} \exp \left(\sigma \sqrt{\rho_j(M_{t_0}, \dots, M_{t_j})} B_{t-t_j} - \sigma^2 \rho_j(M_{t_0}, \dots, M_{t_j}) (t - t_j) / 2 \right).$$

On the other hand, for $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}]$,

$$(4.30) \quad S_t^{(\nu)} = S_{t_j}^{(\nu)} \exp \left(\sigma \sqrt{\rho_j(S_{t_0}^{(\nu)}, \dots, S_{t_j}^{(\nu)})} \hat{B}_{t-t_j} - \sigma^2 \rho_j(S_{t_0}^{(\nu)}, \dots, S_{t_j}^{(\nu)}) (t - t_j) / 2 \right)$$

where $\hat{B}_t = W_{t+t_j} - W_{t_j}$, $t \geq 0$ is a Brownian motion independent of $S^{(\nu)}|_{[0, t_j]}$. From (4.29)–(4.30) and the induction assumption we get that the distribution of $M|_{[0, t_{j+1}]}$ coincides with the distribution of $S^{(\nu)}|_{[0, t_{j+1}]}$ as required. Hence, the distribution of M is the same as that of $S^{(\nu)}$. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Altarovici, J. Muhle-Karbe and H.M.Soner, *Asymptotics with Fixed Transaction Costs*, Finance and Stochastics. **19**, 363–414, (2015).
- [2] P.Bank, Y.Dolinsky and A.P.Perkkiö, "The Scaling Limit of Superreplication prices with Small Transaction Costs in the Multivariate Case", to appear in Finance and Stochastics.
- [3] J.Cvitanić, H.Pham and N.Touzi *A closed-form solution to the problem of superreplication under transaction costs*, Finance and Stochastics. **3**, 35–54, (1999).
- [4] J.C. Cox, A.R.Ross and M.Rubinstein, *Option pricing: A simplified approach*, J. Financ. Econom., **7**, 229–263, (1976).
- [5] Y.Dolinsky, *Hedging of Game Options With the Presence of Transaction Costs*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **23**, 2212–2237, (2013).
- [6] F. Delbaen and W. Schachermayer, *A general version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing*, Math. Annalen. **300**, 463–520, (1994).
- [7] Y.Dolinsky and H.M.Soner, *Duality and Convergence for Binomial Markets with Friction*, Finance and Stochastics., **17**, 447–475, (2013).
- [8] J.F.Eastham and K.J.Hastings, *Optimal Impulse Control of Portfolios*, Math.Oper.Res. **13**, 588–605, (1988).
- [9] P.Guasoni, M.Rasonyi and W.Schachermayer, *Consistent Price Systems and Face-Lifting Pricing under Transaction Costs*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **18**, 491–520, (2008).
- [10] P.Jakubenas, S.Levental and M.Rysnar, *The super-replication problem via probabilistic methods*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **13**, 742–773, (2003).
- [11] S. Kusuoka, *Limit Theorem on Option Replication Cost with Transaction Costs*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **5**, 198–221, (1995).

- [12] R.Korn, *Portfolio Optimisation with Strictly Positive Transaction Costs and Impulse Control*, Finance and Stochastics **2**, 85–114, (1998).
- [13] A.W.Lo, H.Mamaysky, and J.Wang, *Asset Prices and Trading Volume under Fixed Transaction Costs*, J. Polit. Econ. **112**, 1054–1090, (2004).
- [14] S.Levental and A.V.Skorohod, *On the possibility of hedging options in the presence of transaction costs*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **7**, 410–443, (1997).
- [15] A.J.Morton and S.R.Pliska, *Optimal Portfolio Management with Fixed Transaction Costs*, Math. Finance. **5**, 337–356, (1995).
- [16] B.Oksendal and A.Sulem, *Optimal Consumption and Portfolio with Both Fixed and Proportional Transaction Costs*, SIAM J. Control Optimization. **6**, 1765–1790, (2002).
- [17] S. Peng. *Multi-dimensional G-Brownian motion and related stochastic calculus under G-expectation*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **118(12)**, 2223–2253, (2008).
- [18] H.M.Soner, S.E.Shreve and J.Cvitanic, *There is no nontrivial hedging portfolio for option pricing with transaction costs*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **5**, 327–355, (1995).

P.BANK: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TU BERLIN. E.MAIL: BANK@MATH.TU-BERLIN.DE

Y.DOLINSKY: DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, HEBREW UNIVERSITY. E.MAIL: YAN.DOLINSKY@MAIL.HUJI.AC.IL